



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





# THE AMERICAN WAR.

By NEWMAN HALL, LL.D.

A LECTURE, DELIVERED IN LONDON,  
OCTOBER 20, 1862.

NEW YORK :  
ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH,  
No. 683 BROADWAY.  
1863.

---

EDWARD O. JENKINS,  
Printer & Stereotyper,  
No 20 NORTH WILLIAM ST.

# THE AMERICAN WAR.

---

IN this lecture I propose briefly to trace the course of American history in relation to the present war, and then to reply to the questions—Had the South a right to secede? Is the North justified in waging war to restore the Union? How far is the question of Slavery mixed up with the quarrel? On which side should the sympathy of England be enlisted?

## HISTORICAL SKETCH.

The quarrel between the North and the South, though it has only just developed in war, is of long growth. There are physical differences of climate, causing differences of labor, of production, of commercial interests, and of character. Added to this, we must bear in mind the original difference between the colonists. The North was peopled chiefly by the puritan and republican party, escaping from the tyranny of the Stuart kings. The South was peopled chiefly by the cavalier, aristocratic, and monarchical party. The result of the combined action of difference in the original settlers, and difference in the physical features of the countries occupied, was unavoidable. Moreover, emigration naturally flowed

more to the North, as better suited for the energies of Europeans. The labor market of the South was supplied by the importation of Negro slaves. This increased the difference between the North and the South. In the North, partly from motives of political economy, still more from a deeply-rooted love of freedom and from religious considerations, slavery was gradually abolished, while in the South it rapidly increased. Thus, from the beginning, the North and South were different in character, with interests which from being not identical, eventually became antagonistic.

The colonies, having revolted from Great Britain, were constituted as the United States, and on July 4, 1776, the famous Declaration of Independence was issued. The fundamental principle of the Union was this—that while united with the other States for general national objects, each State retained its own sovereign right to regulate its separate affairs. The Union, as such, might deal with commerce, taxation for national purposes, peace and war, foreign relations, and the territories belonging to the States in common; but it could not, as a Union, in any way interfere with the local taxation and expenditure, or the domestic institutions of the several States composing that Union.

Each State was to send two members to the Senate, or Upper House of Congress. And for every 33,000 of population, subsequently raised to 120,000, one member was to be sent to the Lower House, or House of Repre-

sentatives. It is evident that those districts which most increased in population would enlarge their power in Congress, by the increased number of their representatives. Though the South increased, the ratio of increase was much greater in the North. Thus, while originally Virginia sent ten members as compared with six from New York, now, Virginia sends eleven members, while New York sends thirty. Thus the power which rested originally with the South, has gone over to the North by the operation of natural causes and in accordance with the constitution. But this transfer, in every stage of its process, has increased the rivalry between North and South.

The States forming the original Union were thirteen. The thinly occupied districts where as yet there was no sufficient population for self-government, were called Territories, and, as the common property of the Union were governed by Congress. A certain amount of population was a qualification for the Territories to claim admission as new States. As each State sent two members to the Senate, it soon became a question of importance whether the State applying for admission would strengthen the interests of the North, or those of the South. This depended on whether the new State was a Slave State or a Free. The original desire and intention of the founders of the Union was to get rid of slavery altogether. This was seen in the decree of Congress in 1787, forbidding slavery in any of the territories N. W. of the river



Ohio ; as well as by the gradual abolition of slavery in the several Northern States, by the action of their respective governments.

In 1820, a great struggle took place on the question of the admission of Missouri. This district formed part of the territory of Louisiana, where slavery existed when it was purchased from France in 1803. "If admitted, it must be as *Free*," said the North ; "because it is N. W. of the Ohio, and therefore subject to the law of 1787." "If admitted, it must be as *Slave*," said the South ; "because in fact, slavery exists there already." Agreement was brought about by what is called the *Missouri Compromise*. Missouri was admitted as a Slave-State ; but it was decreed that slavery should not be allowed in any State hereafter to be annexed above a certain geographical line ; viz., 36° 30' N. Latitude. South of that limit, the question might be determined by the inhabitants of the district ; in American phrase it was left to "Squatter Sovereignty."

In 1832, another fierce controversy arose. There had been during many years a conflict of interests in relation to tariffs. During war with Great Britain no manufactures were imported. The demand had to be supplied by home produce. Factories sprang up in the North. When peace was proclaimed, and British goods threatened to deluge the market, a high protective duty was put on them by the United States Government, in the interest of their own manufactures. But these manufac-

turers were Northerners. The produce of the South was agricultural only. There were advocates of both systems in the Slave States and in the Free. Yet for the most part the North became protectionists, while the South were chiefly in favor of free-trade. A high tariff in 1832 caused great discontent in South Carolina, which State proceeded to pass an act of "Nullification," refusing to obey the laws of the united government. Their opposition was yielded to, and a modified tariff hastily adopted, in order to preserve the Union from the threatened danger of dismemberment. But on that occasion, President Jackson, in his annual "message" protested that "The right of a single State to absolve themselves from the most solemn obligations cannot be acknowledged."

Another contention arose in connection with Texas, which was a province of Mexico, where slavery had been abolished. A land of freedom in their close neighborhood was a grievance to the Southerners. So, a party of them entered Texas, fomented an insurrection, and raised the standard of revolt. The Mexican army was defeated, and the Southerners demanded that Texas should be recognized and admitted as a new and Slave State. Their cry was "Texas or disunion." Long discussions arose, terminating in the admission of Texas, and consequently a war with Mexico.

Slaves were continually escaping from the southern into the northern States. Here, by the constitution, they were not safe, as the southern masters might claim and

take back their "property." But there were many thorough friends of freedom, who, preferring God's laws to any constitutional enactments, were always ready to protect the fugitive, or convey him safely to Canada. The Southerners complained of the inadequacy of the existing laws to secure their property ; and on their demand, the odious "Fugitive Slave Law" was passed, by which the local authorities were enjoined to aid in the capture and rendition of run-away slaves. The terror caused by this law swept like a hurricane through the North. It took effect on the best examples of the Negro race. In one colored church, 130 members at once fled to Canada. In another, of 114 members, only two remained. The law had not passed without angry controversy, and vehement protests. From many a pulpit the congregation were exhorted to obey God rather than man. Furious riots were caused by attempts to carry back into slavery negroes who for years had been respected for their industry, virtue, and godliness. This still further increased the alienation between North and South.

In 1856, Mr. Sumner, an eloquent opponent of slavery, was sitting in his place in the House of Representatives, when a pro-slavery member named Brooks, incensed by a recent speech of Mr. Sumner, came behind him, and with a heavy stick, beat him on the neck and back of his head, so that he fell stunned and did not recover for several months. We cannot even conceive of such an outrage in our own House of Commons. Any man acting in such a

way would be scouted by the whole nation, and if he professed our particular opinions, we should regard him as the greatest scandal and foe to our party. But what took place in the Southern States? Brooks was extolled as a hero! While the only penalty awarded by the law was a trumpery fine, the *ladies* of South Carolina presented him with a richly mounted cane; from several cities he received presentation sticks inscribed—"Hit him again;" and after his death, a speaker in Congress publicly compared him to Brutus! Such an outrage, so rewarded, was a still further aggravation of the social feud.

The "Dred Scott decision" added fresh combustibles to the smouldering heap. Dred Scott, a slave, taken by his master into free Illinois, and then beyond the line of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ , and then back into Missouri, sued for and obtained his freedom on the ground that having been taken where by the constitution slavery was illegal, his master had lost all claim. But the Supreme Court on appeal reversed the judgment, and Dred Scott with his wife and children was taken back into slavery. By this decision in the highest court of American law it was affirmed that no free negro could claim to be a citizen of the United States, but was only under the jurisdiction of the separate State in which he resided; that the prohibition of slavery in any territory of the Union was unconstitutional; and that the slave-owner might go where he pleased with his property, throughout the United States, and retain his right. The progress of

the trial was attended with great excitement, and the final decision convulsed society throughout the North.

Kansas was long a cause of disquiet. Was it to be received as a Free State, or was it to be claimed by Slavery? Companies of Free-soilers settled there. But organized bands of ruffians from the South entered it, and by numberless acts of violence endeavored to expel the friends of freedom. In these encounters much blood was shed. You remember that, in 1859, John Brown, who, with his sons, had been very active in these struggles, seized the arsenal at Harper's Ferry for the purpose of facilitating the escape of slaves in the neighborhood. His well-intended and heroic, but ill-advised and illegal enterprise failed. He was tried and sentenced to be hung. No northern statesman nor party was proved to have had any connection with the affair. But the excitement produced was very great. A vast array of soldiery was drawn up to prevent a rescue. The South was determined to secure its victim. A woman was among the competitors for the executioner's office, and several States vied with one another for the privilege of providing the hemp for the halter.

The crisis was now at hand. In order to understand it we must bear in mind that in the North there are three parties. The Republicans, or Federals, uphold the constitution as it is; and whatever reforms are required, they would accomplish only by the working out of its established principles; they would not interfere with

the affairs of individual States ; but they are opposed to the extension of slavery into the Territories. This renders them antagonistic to the Southerners. Moreover, they are protectionists in commerce. The Democrats are the opposition party, and are in favor of Free-trade. This formed the first link of sympathy between them and the Southerners. "Evil communications corrupt good manners;" and so it came to pass that the Northern Liberal, contradicting his own principles of freedom, became an ally of the Southern Slave-owner, not only in commerce but in slavery too. The Republican party is Anti-slavery, but this term in America implies only opposition to the extension of slavery into new soil. The Abolition party advocate its entire overthrow. Some of them would accomplish this gradually: but others have earnestly contended that it is a first duty to get rid of so great a wickedness, even at the cost of national existence, and that it would be better that the Union be at once dissolved than that slavery should any longer defile the land. Owing to the weakening of the North by this opposition between the Abolitionists and Republicans, the South has succeeded, by its alliance with the Democrats, in carrying nearly all elections for the office of President. But when Buchanan was elected, the Anti-slavery Fremont so nearly won the day that the South began to take measures in expectation of a reverse at the election of 1860.

The agreement of Abolitionists and Republicans in

the nomination of Abraham Lincoln secured his election. His history is remarkable. His father died when he was a child. He had only six months' schooling. When a little boy he earned his own living by wielding an axe, driving a cart, shepherding flocks, and afterwards working on a river-steamer. Then he took to rail-splitting, and then was clerk in a store, all the while educating himself. He was chosen a member of the parliament of his State; then became a barrister; then was sent to Congress. An avowed opponent of slavery, he was adopted by the Abolitionists. Pledging himself to abide by constitutional law, and under that law to prevent the extension of slavery into the Territories, he was adopted by the Republicans.

The election of 1860 placed him by a large majority at the head of the poll. The news no sooner reached Charleston than the Federal flag was hauled down, and that of the State run up in its place. At a great meeting it was resolved that as the North had elected a president whose opinions and purposes were hostile to Slavery, South Carolina seceded from the Union. A Federal fort was seized, and the Federal Major Anderson retired to Fort Sumter. Other States soon followed the example of South Carolina, and preparations were made for war.

But before Mr. Lincoln came into office, treason in the cabinet had been promoting the secession. Mr. Toucey, in the navy department, had dispersed the fleets, and

Mr. Floyd, in the army department, had transferred military stores to Southern arsenals, appropriated public moneys, and put Southern partizans into offices of trust. Thus the Southerners gained a great advantage at the breaking out of the war, having possession of government property, and being able to carry forward their designs for some time unchecked.

The first act of war was the firing into a Federal steamer while carrying supplies to Fort Sumter, in January, 1861. In March the new President was inaugurated. In his address he declared that he had no lawful right and no inclination to interfere with slavery where it existed, and that he would maintain inviolate the rights of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment. But this had no effect in staying the progress of secession. In April Fort Sumter was bombarded, and Virginia joined the Confederacy. In July occurred the Federal defeat at Bull Run; in August the indecisive battle at Springfield; in September the Federal victory at Somerville; in October the Confederate victory at Leesburg. In November took place the affair of the Trent. Thank God that we were then preserved from being carried into the strife!

The present year 1862 opened amidst mutual preparation for continued conflict. In February Fort Donelson and the city of Nashville was taken by the Federals. In March the Confederate Ram Merrimac destroyed two



Federal ships at the mouth of the James river. In April Island No. 10 surrendered to the Federals, and New Orleans fell into the hands of General Butler. During April and May many fierce battles were fought before Richmond. In June the besieging army suffered a sanguinary defeat ; after which McClellan changed his base of operations, but was soon compelled to retire altogether from the Confederate capital, leaving behind him the bodies of tens of thousands who had perished either in battle or from pestilence. By rapid marches, the Confederate Generals Lee and Jackson were enabled to attack the Federal army under Pope before his junction with McClellan, and on August 29, the Confederates gained their second victory of Bull Run. The Federal army then retreated beyond the Potomac, and fell back on Washington. The Confederates entered Maryland and advanced towards Baltimore ; but not receiving from the Marylanders the support they expected, and being severely handled by McClellan, they recrossed the Potomac into Virginia. After spending several hundred millions of pounds sterling, and after sacrificing several hundred thousands of precious lives, the two great armies still confront each other. A civil war on such a scale, the world has never witnessed. Humanity stands aghast at the contemplation of it. Piety lifts up her hands in supplication and says—"How long, O Lord, how long !"

## I.

## HAD THE SOUTH A RIGHT TO SECEDE?

If they had, it was either a constitutional or a revolutionary right. Had they a constitutional right? If so, this was derived either from the fundamental principles of all government, or from the peculiar constitution of the United States. Do the fundamental principles of government give the right to any section of a nation at its own option to secede from that nation? If a province may do this, so may a county, so may a town. Scotland, Wales, Ireland, might severally separate from Great Britain; then Yorkshire, or Surrey, or this borough of Southwark! There could be no such thing as nationality were such secession to be recognized as lawful. What security would there be for the payment of debts incurred by the nation, if any portion of that nation might, by secession, escape its share of the liability? Who would advance money on such terms? What dependence could be placed on any national engagement? In case of war, the province or city most threatened might secede and make a separate treaty with the foe, or declare its neutrality; and where then would be national safety? The claim of an integral part of an empire, when union appears to itself no longer desirable, to secede without the general consent of the empire of which it forms a part, is destructive to all nationality

But does the peculiar constitution of the United States give a special right of secession? It has been maintained that the several States composing the Union, retain their individual sovereignty. They have their local governors and parliaments, and as by their own decree they originally joined the Union, so, it is said, by a reversal of that decree, they may separate. If so, as we have just shown, the United States never constituted a nation. To unite with such an understanding was not to unite. A constitution with such a proviso would be self-destructive.

If one State may secede from the rest, it is obvious that two States may agree to do the same. Therefore also a majority may agree to secede from the minority. Therefore also all the States but one, may combine to secede from that one. That is to say, according to this notion, any single State may at any time be *expelled* from the Union without its own consent. This unavoidably follows from the right of any single State to secede. Again we say that a constitution with such a proviso would be self-destructive.

It is not the fact that the States retained their sovereign rights uncurtailed. They retained those in respect of which they did not combine: but those which they surrendered as individual States and handed over to the central Government, they had no longer any right to exercise. General taxation for general purposes, coinage, postage, tariffs, peace and war, treaties with foreign

powers—these were prerogatives merged in the Union by the individual States, and could not therefore be resumed except by general consent of the contracting parties. The second of the “Articles of Confederation” declares that every State retains its sovereignty, and every right *which is not by this Confederation especially delegated to the United States in Congress assembled*. Obviously therefore these delegated rights can no longer be claimed. Article V. says that no two or more States shall enter into any treaty, confederation, or alliance whatever between them, without consent of the United States in Congress assembled. But the southern States have done this. They have there rebelled. The constitution of 1787 (Art. III. Sec. 3.) declares that treason against the United States consists in levying war against them or adhering to their enemies. In levying war against the Federal Government, the southern States are therefore, according to the constitution, traitors and rebels.

But where there is no constitutional right of *secession*, there may be a rational right of *rebellion*. In case of glaring abuse of power by the executive, where gross injustice has been perpetrated, where tyranny is unendurable, then the ultimate right of rebellion must be conceded. Thus we rejoice in the recent revolutions in Italy: thus we boast of our own “Glorious Revolution” to which Queen Victoria owes her throne. Had the southern States such a plea? It is sometimes said, that

as the American colonies seceded from Great Britain, so the South may secede from the North. The colonies seceded because they were oppressed, and taxed without being represented. But the South were not oppressed, were not unrepresented. They formed a constituent part of the government. In fact they had a greater proportionate share in the representation than the North.

In the North, population alone determined the franchise, one member being allotted to every 120,000. Persons alone were represented, not property. But in the South, in addition to persons, property was allowed to send members to Congress. Slaves are by the law not persons but mere chattels. Of course they have no votes. Nevertheless, five slaves in the South are reckoned as equal to three free whites, in order to increase the number of representatives. Estimating the slaves at four millions, these would count for 2,400,000 of population, entitling to twenty representatives. Estimating the free population of the South at 6,000,000, their quota of members is fifty. But by the addition of the property qualification they can send 70. Thus the value of a Southern vote exceeds that of a Northern in the proportion of 70 to 50; *i. e.*, is equal to one vote and two-fifths. So that five voters in the South have as much influence as seven voters in the North. They could not therefore, maintaining as they do that the slaves are not persons but mere chattels, complain of not being allowed a fair share in the representation.

Nor could they aver that they had been tyrannically overborne by the North. On the contrary, the North had habitually deferred to them, as we have seen in the admission of Missouri as a slave State contrary to the act of limitation ; in altering the tariff on the demand of South Carolina ; in the admission of Texas, and in passing the Fugitive Slave Law. Moreover, the South had almost always, through alliance with their democrat sympathizers in the North, secured their own candidate for the presidential chair. As long as by securing a majority in Congress they ruled the country, they upheld the Union. As soon as they were in a decided minority and saw the sceptre transferred to their rivals, they seceded. How can any committee work, any society hold together, any government be carried on, unless the minority yield to the majority ? If we submit to laws only so long as our own opinions prevail, what is such submission worth ? Power had changed sides, not through violence, but simply by the operation of natural causes, and in accordance with the constitution. As soon as the Southerners found themselves outvoted, before the new ruler had performed one official act, before he was even inaugurated, while yet their own President retained office, without the plea that any law had been broken, without resorting to any legal method of redress, they threw off their allegiance, and in so doing violated the constitution to which they had sworn, on a plea subversive of the fundamental principles of national exis-

tence. They are therefore rebels, rebels moreover destitute of the only plea by which rebellion can be justified.

## II.

### IS THE NORTH JUSTIFIED IN WAGING WAR TO RESTORE THE UNION ?

The answer is already given. Putting aside abstract peace principles, if the South rebelled, the North was justified in resisting the rebellion. If the South attacked the government the government had a right of self-defence. If national existence is desirable, should not whatever threatens it be resisted ? Is it not the right, is it not the duty of a government to guard the trust committed to it, and sustain its own authority ? What is evident on general principles, is expressly provided for by the Constitution of the United States which, declares (Art. I. sec. 8) that Congress has power to call out the militia to execute the laws of the Union, to *suppress insurrection* and to repel invasion.

It is urged as a complaint against the North that they are fighting for empire. How much more should the South be condemned, "who having always before succeeded in domineering, break off from the Union at the first moment that they can domineer no longer !" The North fight for empire ! Of course they do—but to conserve their own, not to extend by seizing another's. Self-preservation is the first of instincts. Of all nations

in the world Great Britain should be the last to condemn it. Let the battle-fields of India testify how many bloody wars we have waged, not simply for the preservation, but for the extension of empire. Would not our government engage in any war at once, however costly and sanguinary, rather than submit to its forcible dismemberment? The Americans have an empire of which they may well be proud, so vast in area, so varied in its productions, so inexhaustible in wealth, so unparalleled in progress. They have special motives for preserving it one and indivisible. If divided, there will be great difficulty in settling territorial limits. Commerce may be injured by varying and hostile tariffs. The principle of disintegration may develop until there are numberless rival republics. There would be frequent strife between themselves, and peril from foreign foes. Standing armies would be required, and heavy taxation to maintain them. We cannot be surprised that the Federal government should exercise its undoubted right, and fight to avoid these perils and preserve a Union under which their nation has become so great.

We may have our own opinion as regards the *expediency* of the war. We may think that the North and the South are so incompatible in character and interest, that a permanent union between them is impossible. We may think that the area embraced by the Secession is so vast that its subjugation is impossible. Looking on from the outside we may consider that although every Southern



port be blockaded, and victory crown the Federals in every fight, they can never hold the South by force of arms, and that if they could, such enforced union would be worthless. We may think that it would have been wise to have accepted the fact of Secession at the first, even as we may deem it inevitable in the end; and that thus the lavish expenditure of treasure and of blood might have been spared. We may regard that expenditure as wasted, because unlikely to lead to any result; and that even should the end be the restoration of the former Union, that end would not repay the cost. Implicated as the North have so long been in the crime of Southern slavery we may think it would have been better if they had said at once—"You are rebels—you deserve the severest chastisement—but if you choose to go, go!—it will be your loss and our own inestimable gain—for henceforth and for ever we are innocent of any participation in slavery—our land is now cleansed from the stain that has so long polluted it—no more recognition of property in man—no more Fugitive Slave Law—henceforth Canada is virtually brought to the banks of the Potomac, and every slave crossing the border, shall feel as safe under our star bespangled banner, as if the blended crosses of Great Britain waved above his head."

Perhaps the majority of Englishmen entertain such views as these respecting the *expediency* of the war. But there can be no doubt respecting its lawfulness, that is, granting the general right of governments to wage war

for national existence. And we cannot be surprised that the right should be exercised in this case when we consider the grandeur of the empire to be maintained, the special reasons why Americans must desire its preservation, the importance of checking, by this example of firmness, any similar attempts in future, and the sanguine hope of ultimate success which a consciousness of Right imparts, and which is always felt by those who see much more of their own power than that of the foe.

### III.

#### HOW FAR IS THE QUESTION OF SLAVERY INVOLVED IN THE STRUGGLE?

The South seceded and took up arms in order to preserve and extend slavery. The immediate object of the North is the suppression of the rebellion and the preservation of the Union. But that resistance to slavery is the real cause of the war, and the promotion of freedom its ultimate tendency, seems to me most evident.

Bear in mind that during many years the North and South have been struggling for supremacy, and that almost all those struggles have had reference to slavery. The South ever sought to extend the slave territory and increase the pro-slavery influence in Congress. The North ever strove to confine slavery to its original limits. The South *maintained that every citizen had a right to go with his property to every part both of the States and*

the Territories. The North maintained that Congress had the right to legislate for the Territories ; that in the exercise of that right it had decreed that slavery should not pass beyond a certain limit ; that human beings could not there be held as "property ;" and that while by the constitution, slavery could not be interfered with in the States where it existed, it should not spread further. On this question the North and the South practically joined issue.

The great Republican party are pledged to this Anti-Slavery policy. To carry it out, Abraham Lincoln was elected President. The North were resolved that the long controversy should at length end, and the question be set at rest for ever. Henceforth all the world must know that the North would concede no more, and that slavery should make no further advance. But the South were equally resolved to extend it. For this and this alone they took up arms. They did not allege as their plea hostile tariffs or illegal oppression, but, as we shall see, the opposition of the North to their favorite institution. Had the North been fighting *only* for empire, they could have secured the object without the cost of war, simply by yielding this point to the South. But they refused to do so. While then their immediate object in the war was to suppress the rebellion, it is evident that their purpose also was to prevent the extension of slavery.

But in preventing the extension of slavery, the North believed they were promoting the gradual but ultimate

extinction of slavery itself. It is admitted that slavery needs scope for development, and that if restrained within narrow limits it destroys itself. To be remunerative, many laborers must be concentrated and kept to one kind of work, thus exhausting the soil and needing new fields. The South urge this as a plea for secession. "There is not a slaveholder," said Judge Warner, of Georgia, "in this house or out of it, but who knows perfectly well that whenever slavery is confined within certain specified limits its future existence is doomed ; it is only a question of time as to its final destruction. You may take any single slaveholding county in the southern States, in which the great staples of cotton and sugar are cultivated to any extent, and confine the present slave population within the limits of that county. Such is the rapid natural increase of the slaves, and the rapid exhaustion of the soil in the cultivation of those crops (which add so much to the commercial wealth of the country), that in a few years it would be impossible to support them within the limits of such county. Both master and slave would be starved out ; and what would be the practical effect in any one county, the same result would happen to all the slaveholding States. Slavery cannot be confined within certain limits without producing the destruction of both master and slave ; it requires fresh lands, plenty of wood and water, not only for the comfort and happiness of the slave, but for the benefit of the owner." The North tell us they are fight-

ing for the ultimate suppression of slavery by constitutional means. Some people do not give them credit for this. Let us then receive the testimony of their enemies. Surely we should believe the North when they tell us they intend to do what the South complain of as the inevitable effect of their policy.

It is often asked, Why did not the North at the first proclaim a war of freedom? There have always been a band of witnesses in America who have declared that it would be better for the Constitution to perish and the Union to be dissolved, than that such monstrous wickedness as slavery should be tolerated. But the abolitionists have been in a minority, and were always outvoted by the Republican party, who, while opposed to slavery, were determined to abide by the Constitution. The union of a majority of the Abolitionists with Republicans in the election of Mr. Lincoln, has turned the scale against the South. But this has been done on the express understanding that the Constitution is to be adhered to. War is waged with the South for violating it; the North, in quelling the rebellion, is bound to observe the laws for which they fight.

At the risk of repetition I must draw your attention once more to the fundamental principle of the Constitution, which forbids Congress to interfere with the domestic institutions of the several States. Mr. Lincoln took a solemn oath on entering his office, to observe this Constitution. He pledged himself again and again that he

would be faithful to this principle. He cannot, as an honest man, use his power as president except as allowed by the laws. But in accordance with those laws, the Government, of which he is the head, has already done much towards the final triumph of freedom.

Considering how slowly nations move, how tardy is the general progress of reformation, the following acts form no trifling result of less than two years' administration. Slavery has been formally forbidden in all the Territories of the Union. Slavery has been abolished in the District of Columbia, over which Congress has power by the Constitution. Compensation has also been offered from the treasury of the United States, to any separate State which shall emancipate its slaves. A treaty has been entered into with Great Britain for the more effectual suppression of the Slave trade. And wherever the Northern armies go, fugitive slaves are received in large numbers. As many as 60,000 are said to have escaped from Missouri alone, and 80,000 from Virginia. At Port Royal 10,000 are protected by the Federal flag within a few miles of Charleston. Above all, the President has proclaimed that after the first of January, the slaves in all States continuing in rebellion shall be declared free, and that the power of the United States government shall be employed in accomplishing such emancipation.

Many people in England object to this proclamation. They say—"Why was it not issued at first, on the

ground of principle, and not after a period of ineffectual conflict, as a mere exigency of war? And why proclaim liberty only to the slaves of rebels, thus compelling to do right to the negro, those who do wrong to the government; and rewarding those who do right to the government, with the power of continuing to do wrong to their slaves?" It must again be remembered that President Lincoln was restrained by the laws he was sworn to administer, from interfering with the domestic institutions of the several States. The most he can do is to offer compensation. He cannot himself emancipate. But what he cannot do at all in any loyal State, nor by ordinary law in any rebel State, he can do in his military capacity, when required by the exigencies of war. He is restrained by the Constitution from abolishing slavery because he thinks it impolitic or wicked. This is a question for each State to decide. But in quelling a rebellion he may use whatever means become necessary for sustaining the government. With the slaves as laborers, the white population of the South are disengaged for the war. Proclaim freedom to those slaves, and they will either escape, or the Southern army will be crippled by the large numbers needed to guard them. It is on this ground that the President justifies his proclamation as being in accordance with law. He is blamed for doing that which alone he considered within his power; while that which he is censured for not doing, was impossible without breaking his oath and

violating the Constitution. Feeling strongly, but not too strongly, the monstrous wickedness of slavery, and not experiencing the difficulties of Mr. Lincoln's position, it is natural we should think that had we his power, we would at the first have declared slavery to be sinful, and fought against it on the highest and holiest grounds. Had the North done this they would at once have received the sympathy of the friends of freedom throughout the world. But the abolitionists of America who wished to do this, were the minority and had not the power. It was surely better to take instalments of liberty than to get nothing. So they strengthened the Republican party against the Southerners, and if they did not advance as rapidly as they desired, were glad to advance at all.

But is it not a grand advance? No slavery in the Territories! Compensation offered to all States remaining in the Union who will emancipate! Several hundred thousand slaves already free! And on the first of next January, all the slaves of rebel States free—the United States Government which formerly guaranteed them to their owners, now pledged to their emancipation! After so many years during which slavery has seemed not only holding its own, but increasing in influence, is it possible that Englishmen can view emancipation advancing by marches so rapid, without delight and devout thankfulness?

But whatever doubts may be entertained in reference



to the sincerity of the North in fighting *against* Slavery, there can be none as regards the sincerity of the South in fighting for it. They openly avow that their object is to perpetuate and extend this hateful system. When South Carolina seceded it stated as her reasons—that the North had denied the right of property in slaves, had pronounced the institution sinful, had permitted Abolition societies, had aided the escape of slaves, and had elected a president whose opinions were hostile to slavery. The *Richmond Inquirer* vindicated the war on the ground that “the experiment of universal liberty has failed—the evils of free-society are insufferable—free-society is impracticable in the long run—it is everywhere starving, demoralized and insurrectionary ; policy and humanity alike forbid the extension of its evils to new people and coming generations—and therefore free-society must fall and give way to a slave-society, a social system old as the world, universal as man.” The Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy said—“Our new government is founded on the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man ; that slavery is his natural and normal condition. Our new government is the first in the history of the world based on this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth. This stone which was rejected by the first builders is become the chief stone of the corner in our new edifice. Negro slavery is but in its infancy. We ought to increase and expand our institutions. All nations when they cease

to grow begin to die. We should then endeavor to expand and grow. Central America and Mexico are all open to us." Dr. Palmer, preaching at New Orleans, said—"The providential trust of the South is to perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as now existing, with freest scope for its natural development. We should at once lift ourselves intelligently to the highest moral ground, and proclaim to all the world that we hold this trust from God, and in its occupancy are prepared to stand or fall. These slaves form part of our households, even as our children. It is a duty we owe to ourselves, to our slaves, to the world, to Almighty God, to preserve and transmit our existing system of domestic servitude, with the right, unchallenged by man, to go and root itself wherever Providence and Nature may carry it."

The conduct of the Southerners has been in accordance with this explicit avowal of their purpose. When they took Harper's Ferry they seized 2,000 negroes, many of whom were free, and marched them away to slavery. The *National* (U. S.) *Anti-Slavery Standard*, of September 15th, says that a party of colored men sent to Manassas under a flag of truce to bury the dead were seized by the Confederates as soon as they had discharged their humane office and driven away to bondage. General Phelps reported that many negroes sought refuge in the Federal camp, loaded with chains and barbarous irons, deeply scored with lashes, or bleeding from bird-shot wounds.

With such evidence as this, how absurd is the statement sometimes heard that slavery has nothing to do with this war! Nothing to do with it, when but for slavery in the South, resisted in the North, the rebellion would never have broken out? Nothing to do with it, when the Southerners avowedly declare that they fight to maintain and extend it? Nothing to do with it, when tens of thousands in the Federal army would not draw a sword nor fire a shot but in the hope of now and for ever smiting down this Goliath of wickedness? Nothing to do with it, when the Northern army liberates wherever it goes, while the Southerners drive to bondage all in whose veins is a trace of African blood? Ask the multitudes who, since the war broke out have obtained their freedom, whether it has nothing to do with it! It has everything to do with it. It is virtually, if not ostensibly, a war of Emancipation. The South, from the first, declared that it was so on the part of the North. We think it would have been well had the North as explicitly proclaimed it themselves. But whether so intended or not at the beginning, this it has now become by the inevitable progress of events. History has no such conflict on the roll of Freedom's struggles. Never before was tyranny so terrible, contended for so openly, and on such a scale. Never before were millions of one race banded together to fight to the death in defence of a claim to treat another race as mere cattle, and for the further right to spread this pestilence

far and wide through the world, unchecked. Shall slavery continue to degrade millions of our fellow-creatures through future generations, and to extend its deadly influence over new empires—or shall it now receive its death-blow, the children of Africa be free, and America be delivered from what has so long marred her beauty, destroyed her peace, hindered her usefulness, and provoked the wrath of God? This is the great issue now pending!

#### IV.

ON WHICH SIDE SHOULD THE SYMPATHY OF ENGLAND BE  
ENLISTED?

There can be no hesitation as to the reply to this question. Our glorious history, the struggles of our forefathers, the memory of freedom's heroes whose names are household words, our equal laws, the emancipation of our own slaves, our open and inviolable asylum for fugitives from tyranny of every hue and from every land, our frequent remonstrances with our American brethren on this subject, our reiterated and unqualified condemnation of this great sin, our churches, our bibles, our prayers, all demand that every heart should beat in sympathy with those who are banded together to accomplish what we have so long urged upon them, the total abolition of slavery throughout the empire.

How then can we explain the apparent lack of this sympathy? Partly by the prevailing ignorance and mis-

conception respecting American affairs caused by the gross unfairness of our leading newspapers. The *Times* especially, by letters to the editor, and one-sided narratives from correspondents, and clever leading articles, has systematically cast ridicule or condemnation on the North, while it has held up the South to admiration. But the suppression or perversion of truth secures only a temporary purpose. England's heart ever beats true to liberty, and her sympathy will be all the more emphatic from having been thus for a while restrained.

Mere politicians think that it would be better for Europe that the great Republic of America should be divided, and thus many who detest slavery, do not sympathize with the North in their effort to restore the Union. It is generally considered that this effort is hopeless, and that the blood and treasure expended in it are absolutely wasted. Thus the sympathy felt with the North so far as the North is opposed to slavery, is checked in its expression by disapproval of a war so sanguinary, yet so unlikely to lead to any equivalent result. It has been supposed that the North has hitherto been fighting for the Union as it was. But by that Union, slavery was guaranteed in the States where it already existed, and fugitives were sent back to their incensed owners. Not because they are indifferent about slavery, but because they so deeply abhor it; many in this country have no sympathy with the North in a struggle, the issue of which, if they succeed, will in their

opinion, rivet more tightly the fetters of the slave, and render his escape more difficult than ever. They therefore wish the South to become a separate Confederation in order that slavery may cease to have the entire power of the Union to prop it up, and that slaves may the more easily escape by the land of freedom being brought so much nearer to them.

But this tendency to favor the final separation of the southern States will be checked as the true nature of the quarrel is better understood. The South are struggling not about tariffs, not to resist tyranny, not from a noble desire for self-government, but to preserve and extend slavery. We have seen by their own confession, that the maintenance of the Union as it was, would be the destruction of the system. It must spread or die. We have seen how, after years of struggle, the North finally said to the South : "Hitherto shall thou come but no farther," and how, by such restraint of slavery they designed its final extinction. Though when the war first broke out the avowed purpose was to restore the Union as it was, this is no longer the case. We have seen how, since the secession of the South, great advances have been already made towards emancipation. If the South is brought back, it will be no longer as an arrogant dictator, but humbled, crippled, impotent to carry out its evil purposes. After the first of January its slaves will be legally free, and then its restoration will secure a vast territory where the negro race, already

domiciled, will cultivate the soil as free-laborers, their liberty guaranteed by the whole power of the Union. But if the South become a separate nation, they do so avowedly to perpetuate and indefinitely extend all the horrors of slavery.

The Westminster *Quarterly Review* of this month says, "Should these conspirators succeed in making good their independence, and possessing themselves of a part of the territories, being those which are in immediate contact with Mexico, nothing is to be expected but the spread of the institution by conquest (unless prevented by some European power) over that vast country and ultimately over all Spanish America, and if circumstances permit, the conquest and annexation of the West Indies ; while so vast an extension of the field for the employment of slaves would raise up a demand for more, which would in all probability lead to that reopening of the African slave-trade, the legitimacy and necessity of which have long been publicly asserted by many organs of the South. Such are the issues to humanity which are at stake in the present contest between free and slave-holding America ; and such is the cause to which a majority of English writers, and of Englishmen who have the ear of the public, have given the support of their sympathies."

But I repeat, the heart of England beats true to liberty. It is impossible she should sympathize with Slavery. It is impossible therefore, when the question is

clearly understood, that she can sympathize with this Southern conspiracy against humanity. An excellent tract, "Federalists and Confederates," published by Caudwell, 335 Strand, says: "In a war of law against licence, of freedom against slavery, shame upon Christain Britain if she waver in her choice." The New York *Christian Advocate*, quoted in that tract, asks—"How can civilized nations, and particularly Great Britain, answer to God and their consciences for withholding their sympathy from us in this struggle?" Count Cavour, in a despatch at the outbreak of the war, wrote to the Italian minister at Washington: "This reserve will not prevent us from manifesting our sympathies for the triumph of the Northern cause, for their cause is the cause not only of constitutional liberty, but of all humanity. Christian Europe cannot wish success to a party which bears on its standard the preservation and extension of slavery." Is Italy just emancipated, thus to pour out her ungrudging sympathy, and England, during so many centuries the chosen asylum of liberty, to appear indifferent?

We lament that the negro, though free in the North, is deprived of the rights of citizenship, and is often treated, even when learned and refined, as socially inferior to the white man, even when ignorant and vulgar. Let us hope for better days—but meanwhile let us not confound the condition of the Northern free men with that of the Southern slave. Are those Northern negroes themselves willing to go South? Do fugitive slaves ever voluntarily



return? They are witnesses that though their condition is not what it should be, it is infinitely superior to what it was. But we must not forget that Americans may retort on us and say that by the preference given in our markets to slave-grown cotton we have largely contributed to prop up the system. I know you feel sore at the insults America has offered to our government, and the hostile threats she has often uttered. But let us bear in mind that those insults were chiefly given when the Southerners were in power. On them therefore, not on the North, let our displeasure rest. You do not like the brag of some Americans who come over here. But the conduct and language of individuals must not be taken as a fair representation of a whole people. Many Englishmen who travel are rude and haughty, but we do not wish to be judged by such specimens. Some Americans have recently uttered very violent sentiments in reference to us, and the language of some of their journals is most insulting and unjust. But are *we* willing that the foolish utterances of some of our public men shall be taken to be those of the whole nation? Have the Americans nothing to complain of in the tone of some of *our* newspapers. On the other hand have they never shown kind sympathy towards ourselves? Witness the generous hospitality with which they welcome our public men—the excitement of delight with which they hailed the “Great Eastern”—the enthusiastic homage they paid to our Prince of Wales, who was insulted in the Southern capital alone.

Be sure that the heart of the great masses of the people in the Free States beats in sympathy with the heart of the people here.

Why are we asked to sympathize with the South? Because they are supposed to possess qualities which England must always admire. They are so high-minded a race, uncontaminated by what is mercenary and sordid! Yes—one portion of them breeding human beings as you breed cattle, which the other portion buy for using up in the plantations. They are so courteous! Yes—and at the public mart, without a blush examine the teeth and handle the muscles of men and women as you feel a horse, and unmoved by tears, wrench the wife from the husband's folded arms, the child from the mother's last embrace. They boast of ancestry! Yes—but what of brothers, sisters, children? They are so generous! Yes—and brand with serfdom their own offspring, and barter them away for gold. They are so brave! But bravery never bullies and cannot be cruel: yet they threaten and strike the unarmed, unresisting, and crouching suppliant; and would torture even to the death any slave who should persist in claiming to be treated as a man and not a chattel. They are so chivalrous! Yes—and scourge the naked, quivering, bleeding backs of shrieking maidens who resent the dishonor of their lustful advances. They fight for freedom and independence! Yes—freedom to enslave others, and independence of control in practising and extending the area of these abominations.

If we refuse our sympathy to the North, do you suppose we shall ever secure, even if we were sufficiently like themselves to desire it, the sympathy of these Southerners? While we continue to be Britons, and therefore neither slaves, nor, what is worse, slavemasters, is it possible that they can ever love us? For political ends they may at present court our favor. They want to have the blockade broken, to sell their cotton, to be recognized as a Confederacy. But do they not know that England detests and abhors the system which they regard as essential to their existence, the "Corner Stone" of their social fabric? Let them come here and publicly proclaim their principles! Let them come with their iron chains, and bull-hide scourges, and well trained blood-hounds, and with these illustrations of their system advocate their hellish doctrines on our soil sacred to Freedom! We would not do as Southern mobs do to any one who whispers a word about emancipation. No—they should have full liberty to utter their blasphemies—so that they might the more discover how impossible it would be, in any assembly of the people, to obtain any response to their diabolic teaching but that of disgust and execration. We cannot have sympathy with impenitent slavers. We cannot admit them to our holy sacraments, for they are violating every law of humanity, and trampling on the Gospel they have the audacity to profess. We dare not bid them God speed. We cannot sit at the same table with them. We shrink from receiving them into our

houses. Our hand is polluted by grasping theirs. We loathe them as the representatives of the concentration of all villainies. They know it. Can there ever be alliance between us? Can there ever be real sympathy? Impossible! England may alienate the North—she can never embrace the South!

Think again what Slavery is in America. Four millions of negroes are held as mere chattels. It is a terrible power to give one man over another. Knowing what human nature is, we know how such power may be abused. We need no evidence to prove the actual occurrence of any conceivable atrocity. Slaves are held by men of all temperaments. There are slavemasters originally of a kind and gentle disposition. There are others malignant, cruel, and of ungovernable temper. Imagine a slave in the hands of such a master! We are told that people will take care of their own property from self-interest. But we have heard of men stabbing their own valuable horses, and driving them to death. How much more may the fury of passion be aroused when the victim of it has a tongue which can speak and an eye that can flash its remonstrances! No key to "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was needed to prove that the cruelties narrated have actually occurred.

It is said that by extracting reports of assaults and murders from our newspapers, it would be possible to convey a very horrible but false notion of our social system. But these offences are opposed to and punished by

the law of England : the cruelties of slavery are protected by the law of the South. We publish these crimes far and wide that they may be punished and execrated : the South conceal from other nations the atrocities of their system, so that what we hear is nothing compared with what is practised. We are told that the condition of many working men in England is worse than that of the slaves ; and that it is a harder lot to toil in a dark coal mine than in a sunny cotton field. Insulting to British workmen is such sophistry ! Would not every one of you rather, as a free-man, spend all your days in darkness, dirt and danger, than with a palace as your prison, and pampered with luxury, like a slave, body and mind enthralled, and subject to every caprice of the fellow-man who claims you as he does his horse or his dog ?

We are told that all labor is compulsory, and that if the negro, able to subsist with little toil, needs the compulsion of the whip, so in England men have the compulsion of hunger. But who does not feel that such an argument is a contemptible fallacy ? To work to live is a Divine law. Our own nature prompts such industry. Work so done is work done voluntarily—no other will than our own compels it—we are free. But if, willing to incur the natural consequences, I refuse to work, and then am driven to my task through terror of the whip and for another's benefit, then my work is totally changed in its character. It is false that the negro will only thus labor. The *slave* will not. Why should he, when his mas-

ter reaps all the fruit? But let him be sure of receiving and retaining a fair remuneration, and all experience proves that he will labor as cheerfully as others. But if not, who has a right to compel him? Are all men to be forced to labor who will not labor of their own accord? Then the rule will apply to the white man as well as to the black. Then all whose limited wants or acquired property enable them to subsist with little or no toil, are to be compelled as slaves to do for others what they have no incentive to do for themselves! If some of you save money enough to give up work, on this principle you must be compelled to work on! If you can provide for all your wants by working six hours a day, you must be compelled, for the benefit of others, to work twelve! See how these doctrines of slavery threaten the laborer all over the world!

They say the mind of the negro cannot be raised to the level of the white man. But the negro slave is allowed no opportunity of mental improvement. It is a crime in the eye of the law to teach him to read or write! If his mind were so very weak, would there be such fear lest by education he should become unfit for slavery? It is false. Many negroes are far more intelligent than many whites. The slaves in the South, nobly patient, are far superior morally to the masters who oppress, rob and torture them. But if not, does mental superiority give a claim to hold others in bondage? Then the aristocracy in all lands, whose wealth and leisure enable them to at-

tain a higher mental cultivation, have a right to enslave the masses of the people. See how your interests are involved in this question!

Mr. Ludlow, in his "Sketch of the United States," which has been very useful to me in preparing this lecture, says—"The safety of the world demands that these dangerous monomaniacs, however estimable they may be in private life, should be put down, and the sooner the better. Why, you may ask me, for the interests of the world? Because the principles put forth threaten the freedom of the working classes throughout the world. Listen to Mr. Cobb :—"There is, perhaps, no solution of the great problem of reconciling the interests of the labor and capital, so as to protect each from the encroachments and oppressions of the other, so simple and effective as negro slavery. *By making the laborer himself capital, the conflict ceases, and the interests become identical.*" Is there a working man here, or anywhere, whose freedom is not involved by such a doctrine? Are you prepared to be made "capital" that the problem of reconciling labor and capital be solved? Is it not *your* cause, then, that the North is fighting at this moment? No,—it is not a war between black and white which is being waged beyond the Atlantic, it is *the* war, the world-old war between freedom and tyranny, between God and the devil. For the sake of all mankind, once more, these dangerous Southern lunatics must be put down.

They are called lunatics in this passage because many

of them seem to have persuaded themselves that their cause is that of humanity and God! The slave owner of the present day maintains that slavery is commanded by the Bible, and is ready to declare with ex-governor Hammond, of South Carolina, that slavery is an Eden, and that Satan enters it "in the shape of an Abolitionist."

Before, then, you express sympathy with the South, ponder carefully for what it is that, with lunatic frenzy, they are now in arms. They are fighting for the right to regard a fellow human creature as a mere chattel—to appropriate all the produce of his labor—to deny him education—to punish any who tries to teach him—to buy and sell him—to separate husband from wife, parent from child—to deny the marriage relation altogether—to accept no evidence from a negro in a court of justice—to punish and torture him at will—to insult woman's honor without redress—for this the South is fighting. They are fighting for the privilege of perpetrating unchecked, all the cruelties which characterize their system, and which were never more generally practised than at present. Mr. Olmstead, in his work on "Slavery in the South," says that he was told that rich men bid for the overseer who can make the most cotton, and never ask how many niggers they kill. An overseer, superior to most of his class, said to him, "Why, sir, I would not mind killing a nigger more than I would a dog." In the South, when a negro commits an offence for which the



